

ONTARIO PROJECT MID-TERM FINDINGS



A FIVE-YEAR WISE LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH STUDY [2017-2022]

PRESENTED BY

PROJECT CO-LEAD: DR. ANDREA CHAN

GRADUATE ASSISTANT: JASMINE HODGSON-BAUTISTA

INTRODUCTION

Goal

- To follow youth over 3 years who are trained for workforce integration by a group of organizations and to obtain information on whether their circumstances are improving economically, socially and psychologically

Objectives

1. Assess how WISEs training youth-in/at risk for employment and skills development are achieving this goal over time;
2. Compare the impacts of WISEs with more conventional government-funded programs;
3. Analyze whether the economic and social return of WISEs are commensurate with the investment, using social accounting;
4. Support capacity building efforts of our partner organizations

METHODS

Approach

- Longitudinal, quantitatively driven, mixed methods study
- Recruited participants into the project from Sept 2017 to Dec 2018
- After baseline survey, we follow-up with participants after six months, one year, two years and three years (in-process)
- A small portion of participants (5%) also interviewed throughout the project (in-process)

Baseline Sample

- 621 youth between 17 and 35 yrs old who are in employment or skills training programs in Ontario
- The youth participated in training facilitated by 8 partner organizations
 - 4 SEs, 4 traditional training programs

Six month follow-up (response rate from BL)

- Non-SE: 57%; SE: 58%

One year follow-up (response rate from BL)

- Non-SE: 52%; SE: 53%

BASELINE FINDINGS

- There are salient differences in profile between youth who are supported in social enterprises and youth in more conventional, classroom-based training programs
- The overall picture suggests that participants from SEs as a group were in greater precarity at baseline (i.e., higher proportion of SE participants who had less schooling, accessed food banks at least occasionally, experienced barriers to employment relating to mental health and fear of losing government financial assistance, as compared to participants from non-SE participants; SE participants also expressed lower satisfaction with the different areas of wellbeing examined)
- Non-Canadian born and less-precarious groups tend to part of non-SE programs over SE programs

PRELIMINARY FOLLOW-UP FINDINGS

At 6-months and 1-year follow-up:

- Slight overall reduction in some measures of vulnerability for SE group (e.g., foodbank use, housing)
- SE participants were accessing in greater proportion certain support services still through the training organization (e.g., certification support, housing support, health services, counselling support), as compared to the non-SE group
- Greater reduction in proportion of SE participants experiencing different instrumental employment barriers at follow-up, as compared to changes among the non-SE participants
- At 1-year follow-up, more participants from both groups reported being currently employed compared to at 6-months
- Between 6-month and 1-year follow-up, employment status for the SE group has people move out of job searching and out of not employed, in school or job searching for personal reasons and into part-time employed

Table 1a

Asset Areas (SE)	Baseline <i>M(SD)</i>	6-month <i>M(SD)</i>	1-year
Financial Wellbeing	2.25(.83)	2.37(.90)	2.46(.91)
Personal Wellbeing	3.01(.86)	2.86(.97)	2.87(.93)
Access to Services	3.41(.84)	3.31(.93)	3.27(.91)
Human Capital	3.33(.81)	3.36(.89)	3.36(.89)
Family & Community Relations	3.15(.79)	3.05(.93)	3.11(.79)

Table 1b

Asset Areas (Non-SE)	Baseline <i>M(SD)</i>	6-month <i>M(SD)</i>	1-year <i>M(SD)</i>
Financial Wellbeing	2.46(.89)	2.54(.94)	2.67(.90)
Personal Wellbeing	3.40(.90)	3.15(.98)	3.25(.99)
Access to Services	3.65(.82)	3.61(.85)	3.64(.82)
Human Capital	3.53(.78)	3.50(.79)	3.57(.84)
Family & Community Relations	3.41(.84)	3.32(.87)	3.35(.86)

CHANGES TO PERCEPTION OF WELLBEING

Looking at the scores descriptively (**only** within sample):

- Across the 3 time points, there is a small increase in financial wellbeing for both the SE and Non-SE groups.
- Both the SE and non-SE group see a decrease in personal wellbeing from baseline to 1-yr follow-up, and minimal changes to the human capital and family community relations
- SE group sees a slight decrease in access to services from baseline to 1-yr follow-up, while the non-SE group sees no change